



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/597,331

07/20/2006

Henry Tan

2333-00900

9378

23505

7590

10/02/2009

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

David A. Rose

P. O. BOX 3267

HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267

EXAMINER

SAVLA, ARPAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2185

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pathou@conleyrose.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/597,331	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Arpan P. Savla	<b>Art Unit</b> 2185	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### **Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 27, 2009 has been entered.

### **Response to Amendment**

This Office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed July 27, 2009 in response to the Office action dated April 30, 2009. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

## **REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART**

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estakhri et al. (U.S. Patent 6,081,878) (hereinafter "Estakhri") in**

Art Unit: 2185

**view of Koh (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0167376) and Robinson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,388,248) (hereinafter “Robinson”).**

3. **As per claim 1**, Estakhri discloses a portable data storage device including:

a data interface for transferring data into and out of the device (col. 6, lines 25-27; Fig. 6b, element 610), *It should be noted that the "host interface" is equivalent to the "data interface".*

a master control unit (col. 6, lines 35; Fig. 6b, element 642); *It should be noted that the "flash state machine" is equivalent to the "master control unit".*

and at least two flash memory units connected to transfer data to and from the master control unit via respective buses (col. 6, lines 45-49 and 54-64; Fig. 6a, elements 670, 672, 675, 680, and 684); *It should be noted that the "first and second flash memory chips" are equivalent to the "two flash memory units" and that "the first and second buses (680 and 684)" are equivalent to the "respective busses".*

and the master control unit being arranged:

to partition data packets received from the interface into data packet portions (col. 12, lines 11-17); *It should be noted that the "even and odd bytes" are equivalent to the "data packet portions".*

to transmit different ones of the data portions to each of the flash memory units simultaneously using the respective data buses (col. 12, lines 11-17; Fig. 6a, elements 680 and 684);

and to control the flash memory units using control signals which are sent to both the flash memory units (col. 11, lines 16-31; Fig. 9, elements 906, 908, 910, 912, and

Art Unit: 2185

914), the master control unit transmitting at least chip ENABLE signals to both the flash memory units while transmitting the data portions using the buses (col. 11, lines 27-30; col. 12, lines 11-17; Fig. 6a, elements 680 and 684; Fig. 9, element 914).

Estakhri does not disclose an interface controller;

the interface controller being arranged to send data received through the interface to the master control unit;

NAND flash memory units;

and wherein the master control unit is further arranged to simultaneously erase a section of memory space of each of the at least two NAND flash memory units.

Koh discloses an interface controller (paragraph 0045; Fig. 5, element 120); *It should be noted that the "USB controller" is equivalent to the "interface controller".*

the interface controller being arranged to send data received through the interface to the master control unit (paragraphs 0045-0047; Fig. 5);

and NAND flash memory units (paragraph 0046; Fig. 5, elements 22<sub>1</sub>-22<sub>n</sub>).

Estakhri and Koh are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being flash memory systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Koh's USB connector/interface and USB controller within Estakhri's controller 510 as well as use Koh's NAND flash memory within Estakhri's flash memory chips because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded

Art Unit: 2185

the predictable results of flash memory chips with higher densities and larger capacities at lower cost with faster erase, sequential write, and sequential read speeds by using NAND flash memory, as well as allowing the combined system to be compliant with the USB standard.

The combination of Estakhri/Koh does not disclose the master control unit is further arranged to simultaneously erase a section of memory space of each of the at least two NAND flash memory units.

Robinson discloses the master control unit is further arranged to simultaneously erase a section of memory space of each of the at least two flash memory units (col. 24, lines 63-68; col. 12, lines 33-35; Figs. 5A-5C, elements 80-99; Fig. 6, element 150). *It should be noted that "card control logic" is equivalent to the "master control unit" and "flash memories 80-99" are each equivalent to a "flash memory unit".*

The combination of Estakhri/Koh and Robinson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being flash memory systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Robinson's all zones chip enable circuitry within Estakhri/Koh's NAND flash memory system, such that the NAND flash memory chips can be erased in parallel simultaneously. The motivation for doing so would have been to permit relatively rapid erasure and programming of flash memories. Relatively rapid erasure of flash memories can be important, for example, for removing old data in preparation for receiving new data. Relatively rapid erasure and programming of flash

Art Unit: 2185

memories can be important, for example, in the testing of flash memories (Robinson, col. 25, lines 2-7).

4. **As per claim 2**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses the NAND flash memory units are arranged to transmit simultaneously to the master control unit data packet portions, the master control unit being arranged to combine them to form data packets, and transmit the data packets to the interface controller for transmission through the interface controller (Estakhri, col. 8, line 61 – col. 9, line 2; Koh, paragraphs 0045-0047).

5. **As per claim 3**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses there are two NAND flash memory units, and the master control unit is arranged to divide the data packets into data packet portions such that each word of the data to be stored is divided into two bytes which are included in data packet portions for different ones of the NAND flash memory units (Estakhri, col. 12, lines 11-29; Koh, paragraph 0046). *It should be noted that an “even byte” is stored in the “first flash memory chip” while an “odd byte” is stored in the “second flash memory chip”.*

6. **As per claim 4**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses the master control units sends identical control signals simultaneously to both the NAND flash memory units through pins of the master control unit which are each electrically connected to a control signal line, each control signal line leading to respective control signal inputs of the each of the NAND flash memory units (Estakhri, col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 5; Fig. 6a, elements 690, 694, 696, 698, 702, and 704; Fig. 6b, elements 692 and 700; Koh, paragraph 0046).

7. **As per claim 5**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses the master control unit transmits identical WRITE, READ, ENABLE and ALE signals to the respective NAND flash memory units (Estakhri, col. 11, lines 20-31; Fig. 9, elements 908, 910, 912, and 914; Koh, paragraph 0046; Robinson, col. 24, lines 54-62).

8. **As per claim 6**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses the interface is a USB interface, and the interface controller is a USB controller (Koh, paragraph 0045; Fig. 5, elements 21 and 121).

9. **As per claim 8**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses the respective data buses are 8-bit buses (Estakhri, col. 6, lines 59-64; Fig. 6a, elements 680 and 684).

10. **As per claim 9**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses each of the data packets has a predetermined size of 512 bytes (Estakhri, col. 7, lines 31-33).

11. **As per claim 13**, Estakhri discloses a method of storing data in a portable data storage device including a data interface for transferring data into and out of the device, a master control unit having a cache memory, and at least two flash memory units, the method including the steps of:

the master control unit partitioning the data packets received from the interface into data packet portions, and transmitting different ones of the data packet portions simultaneously to each of the flash memory units simultaneously through different respective buses (col. 6, lines 54-64; col. 12, lines 11-17; Fig. 6a, elements 675, 680, and 684), and controlling the flash memory units using control signals which are sent to both the flash memory units (col. 11, lines 16-31; Fig. 9, elements 906, 908, 910, 912,



Art Unit: 2185

and 914), the master control unit transmitting WRITE instructions and chip ENABLE control signals to both the flash memory units (col. 11, lines 1-14, 27-30, and 48-52; Fig. 9, elements 902, 904, and 914), and subsequently, while still sending the chip ENABLE control signals, transmitting the data packet portions to the respective flash memory units using the respective buses (col. 12, lines 11-17; Fig. 6a, elements 680 and 684), the respective flash memory units storing the data packet portions (col. 12, lines 17-29).

Estakhri does not disclose an interface controller;

the interface controller being arranged to send data received through the interface to the master control unit;

NAND flash memory units;

wherein the method further includes the step of the master control unit simultaneously erasing a section of memory space of each of the at least two NAND flash memory units.

Koh discloses an interface controller (paragraph 0045; Fig. 5, element 120); *It should be noted that the "USB controller" is equivalent to the "interface controller".*

the interface controller being arranged to send data received through the interface to the master control unit (paragraphs 0045-0047; Fig. 5);

and NAND flash memory units (paragraph 0046; Fig. 5, elements 22<sub>1</sub>-22<sub>n</sub>).

Estakhri and Koh are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being flash memory systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Koh's USB connector/interface and USB controller within Estakhri's controller 510 as well as use Koh's NAND flash memory within Estakhri's flash memory chips because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded the predictable results of flash memory chips with higher densities and larger capacities at lower cost with faster erase, sequential write, and sequential read speeds by using NAND flash memory, as well as allowing the combined system to be compliant with the USB standard.

The combination of Estakhri/Koh does not disclose the method further includes the step of the master control unit simultaneously erasing a section of memory space of each of the at least two NAND flash memory units.

Robinson discloses the step of the master control unit simultaneously erasing a section of memory space of each of the at least two NAND flash memory units (col. 24, lines 63-68; col. 12, lines 33-35; Figs. 5A-5C, elements 80-99; Fig. 6, element 150).

The combination of Estakhri/Koh and Robinson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being flash memory systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Robinson's all zones chip enable circuitry within Estakhri/Koh's NAND flash memory system, such that the NAND flash memory chips can be erased in parallel simultaneously. The motivation for doing so would have been

Art Unit: 2185

to permit relatively rapid erasure and programming of flash memories. Relatively rapid erasure of flash memories can be important, for example, for removing old data in preparation for receiving new data. Relatively rapid erasure and programming of flash memories can be important, for example, in the testing of flash memories (Robinson, col. 25, lines 2-7).

12. **As per claim 14**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses retrieving data from a portable data storage device, the method including the steps of:

the master control unit issuing simultaneously to the flash memory units respective READ instructions and chip ENABLE signals (Estakhri, col. 8, lines 61-65; Robinson, col. 24, lines 54-62);

the flash memory units in response to the READ instructions, and while still receiving the chip ENABLE control signals, transmitting simultaneously the data to the master control unit through different respective buses (Estakhri, col. 8, line 65 – col. 9, line 2);

the master control unit combining the data received from the flash memory units for form data packets and transmitting the data packets to the interface controller (Estakhri, col. 8, line 61 – col. 9, line 2; Koh, paragraphs 0045-0047);

and the interface controller sending data packets received from the master control unit out of the device through the data interface (Koh, paragraphs 0045-0047).

13. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estakhri in view of Koh and Robinson as applied to claim 6 above, and further in

Art Unit: 2185

**view of EverythingUSB, “USB 2.0 FAQ - Information – Drivers” (hereinafter “USB 2.0”).**

14. **As per claim 7**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses all the limitations of claim 7 except the interface operates according to a USB standard in having a data transfer rate of at least 480 Mbits/s.

USB 2.0 discloses the interface operates according to a USB standard in having a data transfer rate of at least 480 Mbits/s (pg. 1, section titled “How fast is USB 2.0?”).

The combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson and USB 2.0 are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being computer systems.

At the time of the invention it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to substitute USB 2.0's USB 2.0 specification for Estakhri/Koh/Robinson's USB 1.1 specification because the simple substitution of one known element (USB 2.0 specification) for another (USB 1.1 specification) would have yielded the predictable results of a 40 times faster data rate which will in turn broaden the range of external peripherals that can be used on a computer as well as reduce bandwidth bottlenecks.

**15. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estakhri in view of Koh and Robinson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,699,297) (hereinafter “Yamazaki”).**

16. **As per claim 10**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson discloses transmitting the signal to each of the NAND flash memory units which causes them to erase a section of their respective memory spaces (Estakhri, col. 19, lines 10-11 and 56-63; col. 20, lines 28-34; Fig. 14, element 906; Koh, paragraph 0046).

The combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson does not disclose the master control unit is operative to instruct each NAND flash memory unit to transfer a portion of the data stored in that section of the memory space to a different location.

Yamazaki discloses the master control unit is operative to instruct each NAND flash memory unit to transfer a portion of the data stored in that section of the memory space to a different location (col. 3, lines 30-34 and 46-55; Fig. 1, elements 1, 2, and 9). *It should be noted that the "erase and write control circuit" is equivalent to the "master control unit" and the "RAM" is equivalent to the "different location".*

The combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson and Yamazaki are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being flash memory systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to couple Yamazaki's temporary evacuation RAM to Estakhri/Koh/Robinson's NAND flash memory chips because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded the predictable results of preventing retained data (i.e. unmodified data) from being degraded due to the driving of the flash memory during an erase operation.

17. **As per claim 10**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson/Yamazaki discloses the different location is in a RAM memory (Yamazaki, col. 3, lines 46-55; Fig. 1, element 2).

Art Unit: 2185

**18. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estakhri in view of Koh and Robinson as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Yamazaki et al. as applied to claim 10 above, and even further in view of Hasbun et al. (U.S. Patent 5,581,723).**

19. **As per claim 12**, the combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson/Yamazaki discloses all the limitations of claim 12 except the different location is in a location in the respective memory spaces outside the section which is to be erased.

Husbun discloses the different location is in a location in the respective memory spaces outside the section which is to be erased (col. 9, lines 44-58; col. 10, lines 14-17; Fig. 4, elements 57 and 61).

The combination of Estakhri/Koh/Robinson/Yamazaki and Hasbun are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being flash memory systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Hasbun's cleanup/erase procedure to Estakhri/Koh/Robinson/Yamazaki's flash memory chips because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded the predictable results of providing a means for reliably storing block structure data during an erase operation in a flash memory array.

**Response to Arguments**

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection above.

**Conclusion**

**STATUS OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION**

The following is a summary of the treatment and status of all claims in the application as recommended by MPEP 707.70(i):

**CLAIMS REJECTED IN THE APPLICATION**

Per the instant office action, **claims 1-14** has received an action on the merits and are subject of a non-final action.

**RELEVANT ART CITED BY THE EXAMINER**

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in Applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. See MPEP 707.05(e).

U.S. Patent 6,529,416 (Bruce et al.) discloses multiple flash chips are erased in parallel.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arpan P. Savla whose telephone number is (571) 272-1077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2185

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sanjiv Shah can be reached on (571) 272-4098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Arpan Savla/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2185  
September 28, 2009

/Sanjiv Shah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2185